

**TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND CONSERVATION**

Division of Water Resources

William R. Snodgrass Tennessee Tower, 312 Rosa L. Parks Avenue, 11th Floor, Nashville TN 37243

1-888-891-8332 (TDEC)

## Compliance Inspection for General NPDES Permit for Stormwater Discharges from Construction Activities (CGP)

<b>Site/Project Name:</b>		<b>Memphis Regional Intermodal Facility (IMF) - Norfolk Southern Railway Company</b>		<b>NPDES Tracking Number:</b>	<b>TNR153856</b>
				<b>Date Coverage was Issued</b>	<b>13-DEC-13</b>
<b>Street Address or Location:</b>		3000 Norfolk Southern Way, Piperton		<b>Start date:</b>	01-DEC-13
				<b>Estimated end date:</b>	31-OCT-14
<b>Site Description:</b>		Convert temporary sediment control basins into permanent stormwater basins. Continue vegetating areas disturbed during IMF construction.		<b>Latitude (dd.dddd):</b>	35.02694
				<b>Longitude (-dd.dddd):</b>	-89.5733
<b>County(ies):</b>	Fayette	<b>EFO:</b>	Memphis	<b>MS4 Jurisdiction:</b>	N/A
				<b>Acres Disturbed:</b>	40
				<b>Total Acres:</b>	

<b>Name of Permittee (Developer/Operator):</b> Norfolk Southern Railway Company				
<b>Name of Official Contact:</b> Anthony Caruso		<b>Email:</b> Anthony.Caruso@nscorp.com		<b>Contact Phone:</b> 901-375-9477
<b>Address:</b> 1200 Peachtree St. NE, 7-142		<b>City:</b> Atlanta		<b>State:</b> GA <b>Zip:</b> 30309

Check List (office & field checks)		Yes	No	Comments
1	Does the site have CGP coverage?	X		
2	Is NOC posted on site?			Not observed
3	Have the site contractors signed the NOI?			Only WCA Land Development has signed on to the coverage
4	Is the current SWPPP available for review?			In MEFO file
5	Are EPSCs in accordance with SWPPP?	X		See comments
6	Are EPSCs installed properly and functional?	X		See comments
7	Are inspection reports available on site?			Not observed/not requested
8	Is the proper buffer zone maintained?	X		
9	Inactive areas stabilized in 14 days? (7 days for steep slopes?)			See comments
10	Are more than 50 acres disturbed at one time?		X	
11	Has sediment discharged off site?			No off-site sediment discharge observed at time of inspection
12	Has sediment discharged into waters of the State?			Not verified
13	Are there unauthorized alterations to waters of the State?		X	
14	Are there violations of an existing ARAP? If so, ARAP No.?		X	
15	Other pollutants/discharges or unusual problems?		X	
16	Project complete & stable; no constr.-related SW discharges?	X		

<b>General Comments:</b> See attached inspection notes and observations.											
<div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> <div></div> </div>											
Routine	X	Comprehensive		Complaint		Follow Up		Termination	X		

<b>On-Site Contact (if available)</b>			
<b>On-Site Contact Name (Print):</b> Mr. Mark Sheets Mr. Wes VanMeter	<b>On-Site Contact Title:</b> ISA Terminal Manager Assistant Manager – Intermodal Operations	<b>Signature:</b>	<b>Date:</b>

<b>TDEC Personnel/Information</b>		<b>Memphis Environmental Field Office</b> <b>8383 Wolf Lake Drive</b> <b>Bartlett, Tennessee 38133</b> <b>Inspector's Phone:</b> <b>901-371-3028</b>
<b>Inspector's Name (Print):</b> Cliff Caudle	<b>Signature:</b> 	

**Memphis Regional Intermodal Facility (IMF) - Norfolk Southern Railway Company**  
**Fayette County, Tennessee**  
**TNR153856**  
**May 26, 2017**

**Weather: ~ 83°F, somewhat humid, mostly clear with occasional scattered clouds**

Cliff Caudle of the Division of Water Resources performed a routine inspection of the site, and was escorted during the inspection by Mr. Mark Sheets, Terminal Manager, Intermodal Services of America, and Mr. Wesley VanMeter, Norfolk Southern Corporation, Assistant Manager – Intermodal Operations.

Areas around the Loop Track appeared well-vegetated, including Outfall 34, as previously noted in the May 6, 2016 and the August 18, 2016 inspections.

Permanent Basin 4: Slopes in Permanent Basin 4 appeared well-vegetated (Photos 1, 2, 3), including the bench above and north of the concrete outfall structure (Photo 3). The flow path from the bench to the outfall was stable with riprap (Photo 3). The low flow channel from the south end of the basin northward beyond the confluence with the east drainage in the basin had been stabilized with rip-rap (Photos 1 & 2). From the end of the riprap northward to the intake structure, the low flow channel had been stabilized with cementitious geosynthetic composite matting (Photo 1), stabilizing the scouring noted in this area in previous inspections. The stone filter ring immediately up-gradient from the culvert intake was still in place. Flow from this basin discharges directly to Outfall SW9 and Stream 5.

Large Eastern Slope and Conveyance: Additional work had been performed since the August 18, 2016 inspection on the rip-rap flume down the large eastern slope, near light pole 115, which had previously failed (Photo 4). The flume appeared to be well-stabilized, and the portion of the conveyance below the flume, where sediment was observed in previous inspections to have accumulated, was well-vegetated (Photo 5).

The slump slope failure near light pole 125 observed at the time of the May 6, 2016 inspection was noted as repaired with riprap and stable during the August 18, 2016 inspection. The riprap repair was intact at the time of the inspection with no issues noted (Photo 6).

A large, sparsely vegetated area was observed in the vicinity of light pole 129 above the eastern conveyance during the May 6, 2016 and August 18, 2016 inspections. The slope had been fully stabilized with cementitious geosynthetic composite matting, which appeared to have been correctly keyed into grade on all sides. The slope appeared to be fully stabilized with no issues noted (Photos 7 & 8).

The north end of the storm water conveyance/retention basin along the east side of the intermodal yard appeared well-vegetated. The levee at the north end of the east conveyance/retention basin, and the slopes from the levee to the outfall/culvert/wingwall structure at SW9 were well-vegetated. Slopes around Outfall SW9 appeared well-vegetated (Photo 9).

Outfall SW 12 and Stream 6: Slopes around Outfall SW12 were well-vegetated. Water in Stream 6 (very low flow) was clear over a sandy bottom.

Permanent Basin 3: Permanent Basin 3 appeared well-vegetated (Photo 10).